arXiv:1303.0128v2 [quant-ph] 29 Apr 2013

Quantum Anonymous Veto with Hardy Paradox

Ramij Rahaman,[1] Marcin Wieśniak,[1] and Marek Żukowski[1]
[1]*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*

The Anonymous Veto (or dining cryptographers) problem, which allows a voting party in a jury to anonymously veto a decision, which is to be approved unanimously, has a classical solution in form of a protocol, security of which is guaranteed only by computational hardness. We present a generalization to a multi qu*D*it case of Hardy's argument against local realism, which avoids statistical inequalities, and show that generalized Hardy-type correlations allow a simple quantum solution of the problem. This is possible because Hardy-type conditions for correlations precisely determine a specific genuine multipartite entangled state, which can satisfy them.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Dd, 03.67.Ac

Introduction: In 1964, J.S. Bell, proved that one can find measurement correlations for a composite quantum system which cannot be described by any local hidden variable theory (LHVT) [1]. The approach of Bell was statistical. Bell's inequalities, in fact, are statistical predictions about measurements made on particles far separated from each other. A direct contradiction between quantum mechanics and local realism was found in 1989 by Greenberger, Horne and Zeilinger (GHZ)[2]. In their argumentation they used correlations of a state of four spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\,0000\rangle - |\,1111\rangle)$, and remarked that for the three-qubit analog of the state their thesis holds too. Although their proof is direct, it requires at least the eight-dimensional Hilbert space and works only for the aforementioned states, in contrast to Bell inequalities [3]. In 1992, Lucien Hardy [4] gave a proof of a no-go theorem for local hidden variables which requires only two qubits, for almost all pure entangled states, and does not require inequalities. We extend the approach of Hardy to more complicated situations, and show that Hardy-type conditions for correlations precisely determine a specific genuine multipartite entangled state [26], which can satisfy them.

The structure of multipartite entanglement is not a simple extension of the bipartite one. E.g., for three qubits there are two different classes of pure genuinely three-partite entanglement, and also one may have entanglement of just two parties. Most of features of bipartite entanglement are well understood, whereas the multipartite entanglement this is still not the case [5–14]. The rich structure of the multipartite entanglement can be used for various tasks, such as quantum computation [15], quantum simulation [16], quantum metrology [17]. This inspired broad theoretical and experimental studies, [18, 19]. We show here that the generalized Hardy correlations studied here can be used to construct a *simple* quantum protocol for anonymous veto, which is a cryptographic problem with classical solutions, security of which is based on *computational hardness*, see [21] and [20]. Secure protocols for anonymous veto (or related "dining cryptographers"), allow to take decisions, by some jury, which must be unanimous, without ever revealing the possible vetoing party(-ies). Thus, they are important in many aspects for functioning of human societies.

Hardy-type argument for arbitrary n-partite system: Before describing our test, we briefly mention a generalized form of Hardy's argument and basic related results.

Consider n subsystems shared among n separated parties. Assume that i-th party can measure one of two observables, $\hat{u}_i$ and $\hat{v}_i$, on the local subsystem. The outcomes x_i of each such measurement can be $1, 2, ..., d_i$. Here d_i is the dimension of Hilbert space associated to the i-th subsystem. We now consider all the joint probabilities $P(\hat{x}_1 = x_1, \hat{x}_2 = x_2, ..., \hat{x}_n = x_n)$, where $\hat{x}_i \in \{\hat{u}_i, \hat{v}_i\}$. A Hardy-type argument [4] can start from the following set of conditions:

$$\begin{gathered} P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{u}_i = 1) = q > 0, \\ \forall\ r:\ P(\forall\ i \neq r:\ \hat{u}_i = 1, \hat{v}_r \neq d_r) = 0, \\ P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{v}_i = d_i) = 0, \end{gathered} \tag{1}$$

where $P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{x}_i = x_i)$ denotes $P(\hat{x}_1 = x_1, \hat{x}_2 = x_2, ..., \hat{x}_n = x_n)$, and we use the convention $n + 1 \equiv 1$. This set of conditions cannot be satisfied by any LHVT.

To see this explicitly, let λ be a local hidden variable (LHV), fully describing the entire system, taking values from a set Ω and $\rho(\lambda)$ be the complete state description for the joint system. In a LHVT description there exists conditional probabilities $f(u_j|\hat{u}_j, \lambda)$, $f(v_j|\hat{v}_j, \lambda)$, such that $P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{x}_i = x_i) = \int_{\lambda\in\Omega} d\lambda\rho(\lambda)\ \prod_{j=1}^{n} f(x_j|\hat{x}_j, \lambda)$, where $\hat{x}_j \in \{\hat{u}_j, \hat{v}_j\}$. Thus, from the first condition in (1) we see that there exists a hidden variable subset of Ω of a non-zero measure, say Ω', within which for all i one has $f(1|\hat{u}_i, \lambda) \neq 0$, and additionally $\rho(\lambda) \neq 0$. Now the second condition of (1) provides us for all r, $f(v_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda) = 0$ for all $v_r \neq d_r$ and for all λ's in Ω'. As one must have $\sum_{v_r=1}^{d_r} f(v_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda) = 1$, this immediately implies that $f(d_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda) = 1$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega'$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{v}_i = d_i) &= \int_{\lambda\in\Omega} \prod_{r=1}^{n} f(d_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda)\ \rho(\lambda)\ d\lambda \\ &\geq \int_{\lambda\in\Omega'} \prod_{r=1}^{n} f(d_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda)\ \rho(\lambda)\ d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\lambda\in\Omega'} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is in contradiction with the last condition from set (1). Hence, conditions (1) cannot hold for LHVT. A similar proof is also given in [22] for a three spins-$\frac{1}{2}$ system.

Modified Hardy-type argument for arbitrary n-partite system: Similarly to the well-known Hardy conditions (1), the modified argument for genuine n-partite entanglement also starts from the following set of joint probability conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{u}_i = 1) &= q > 0, \\ \forall\ r:\ P(\hat{v}_r \neq d_r, \hat{u}_{r+1} = 1) &= 0, \\ P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{v}_i = d_i) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

which, taken together, cannot be satified by any local hidden variable theory (LHVT).

The proof is similar to the previous one. Consider a LHVT as above. From the first condition in (2) we see that there exists a value range (Ω'', say) of Ω within which, for all r, all the probabilities $f(1|\hat{u}_r, \lambda)$ and $\rho(\lambda)$ are all non-zero. The second condition from (2) provides us for all r, $f(v_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda) = 0$ for all λ's in Ω'' and for all $v_r \neq d_r$. This immediately implies that $f(d_r|\hat{v}_r, \lambda) = 1$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega''$. Therefore, $P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{v}_i = d_i) > 0$, which contradicts the last condition of (2).

General non-signaling theory(GNST) satisfying Hardy-type argument: In the framework of a general probabilistic theory, consider a system of n separated parties, which together satisfy all the conditions of the modified Hardy-type argument, as given by Eqs. (2). Then, the normalization conditions on the joint probabilities $P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{x}_i = x_i)$ are:

$$\sum_{x_1=1}^{d_1} \sum_{x_2=1}^{d_2} \ldots\ldots \sum_{x_n=1}^{d_n} P(\forall\ i:\ \hat{x}_i = x_i) = 1, \tag{3}$$

where $\hat{x}_j \in \{\hat{u}_j, \hat{v}_j\}$.

Let also consider the n-partite system described by a general non-signaling theory. For all r, the marginal joint probabilities of $\{1, 2, ..., n\} \setminus r$ the following conditions must be satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} &\textstyle\sum_{u_r=1}^{d_r} P(\forall\ i \neq r:\ \hat{x}_i = x_i, \hat{u}_r = u_r) \\ &\quad = \textstyle\sum_{v_r=1}^{d_r} P(\forall\ i \neq r:\ \hat{x}_i = x_i, \hat{v}_r = v_r). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

What is the maximum probability of success, $P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{u}_i = 1)$, of the modified Hardy-type argument (2) under GNST for an n-partite system, subject to the constraints given in Eq. (3) and Eq. (4)? We have calculated the maximum probability of success $P(\hat{u}_1 = 1, \hat{u}_2 = 1, \hat{u}_3 = 1)$ for three two-level system and we have found that the maximum value, $P(\hat{u}_1 = 1, \hat{u}_2 = 1, \hat{u}_3 = 1)_{max}$ is $\frac{1}{3}$ under GNST. Interestingly, the maximum probability of success in modified Hardy-type argument, q of (2), for three two-level systems is less than the corresponding two two-level case in GNST. Whereas, the maximum probability of success of conventional Hardy-type argument (1) in GNST for both the two two-level systems and three two-level systems turns out to be $\frac{1}{2}$ [23].

Modified Hardy-type argument and multipartite entanglement:

Theorem 1. *Only a genuine multipartite entangled state satisfies the modified Hardy-type conditions (2).*

Proof. Consider state ρ satisfying conditions (2), which is not genuinely n-partite entangled, i.e., it is bi-separable with respect to some cut, say, $(1, 2, ..., m)$ vs. $(m+1, m+2, ..., n)$. The proof for any other bipartite cut is goes along the same line. For the assumed bi-separability, all joint probabilities can be expressed as $P_\rho(\forall\ i:\ \hat{x}_i = x_i) = \sum_k p_k Q_k(\forall\ j \leq m\ :\ \hat{x}_j = x_j) R_k(\forall\ l > m\ :\ \hat{x}_l = x_l)$. Hence all the probabilities involved in condition (2) can be rewritten in the following way:

$$\begin{gathered} \textstyle\sum_k p_k Q_k(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{u}_j = 1)\ R_k(\forall\ l > m:\ \hat{u}_l = 1) = q > 0, \\ \forall\ r < m:\ \textstyle\sum_k p_k Q_k(\hat{v}_r \neq d_r, \hat{u}_{r+1} = 1) = 0,\ i.e.,\ Q_k(\hat{v}_r \neq d_r, \hat{u}_{r+1} = 1) = 0,\ \forall\ k, \\ \textstyle\sum_k p_k Q_k(\hat{v}_m \neq d_m)\ R_k(\hat{u}_{m+1} = 1) = 0,\ i.e.,\ Q_k(\hat{v}_m \neq d_m) = 0,\ \forall\ k, \\ \forall\ l > m\ :\ \textstyle\sum_k p_k R_k(\hat{v}_l \neq d_l, \hat{u}_{l+1} = 1) = 0,\ i.e., R_k(\hat{v}_l \neq d_l, \hat{u}_{l+1} = 1) = 0,\ \forall\ k, \\ \textstyle\sum_k p_k Q_k(u_1 = 1)\ R_k(\hat{v}_n \neq d_n) = 0,\ i.e.,\ R_k(\hat{v}_n \neq d_n) = 0,\ \forall\ k, \\ \textstyle\sum_k p_k Q_k(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{v}_j = d_j)\ R_k(\forall\ l > m:\ \hat{v}_l = d_l) = 0. \end{gathered} \tag{5}$$

From the first and last condition of Eqs. (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_{k^*}(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{u}_j = 1) = q_1 > 0 \ \text{ and } \ R_{k^*}(\forall\ l > m:\ \hat{u}_l = 1) = q_2 > 0 \quad \text{for some } k^* \in \{k\}, \\ &\text{and, } \ Q_k(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{v}_j = d_j) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad R_k(\forall\ l > m:\ \hat{v}_l = d_l) = 0 \quad \text{for all } k. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Eqs. (5) and Eqs. (6) are inconsistent with no-signaling constraint (4). From the last condition of (6) we must have either $Q_{k^*}(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{v}_j = d_j) = 0$, or $R_{k^*}(\forall\ l > m:\ \hat{v}_l = d_l) = 0$. Without any loss of generality, let $Q_{k^*}(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{v}_j = d_j) = 0$ and from the marginal joint probabilities for '$\{1, 2, ..., m\} \setminus r$' parties we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\textstyle\sum_{v_r=1}^{d_r} Q_{k^*}(\forall j < r, l > r : \hat{v}_j = d_j, \hat{v}_r = v_r, \hat{u}_l = 1) \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{u_r=1}^{d_r} Q_{k^*}(\forall j < r, l > r : \hat{v}_j = d_j, \hat{u}_r = u_r, \hat{u}_l = 1). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

From Eq. (7) for $r = m$ we have, $Q_{k^*}(\forall\ j < m:\ \hat{v}_j = d_j, \hat{u}_m = 1) = 0$, as all the terms in left-hand side of Eq. (7) are zero by Eq. (5), and all terms in right-hand-side are non-negative. Similarly, from Eq. (5) and Eq. (7) for $r = m - 1$ we get

$$Q_{k^*}(\forall\ j < m-1:\ \hat{v}_j = d_j, \hat{u}_{m-1} = 1, \hat{u}_m = 1) = 0.$$

If we continue this process, we will finally end up with $Q_{k^*}(\forall\ j \leq m:\ \hat{u}_j = 1) = 0$. Hence we reach to a contradiction with conditions (6). Since the proof is analogous for all cuts, no mixture of bi-separable states with respect to different cuts can satisfy all the Hardy conditions. $\square$

Construction of state satisfying (2): Can one pinpoint a class of states which satisfy conditions (2), for specific pairs of local observables? For this purpose we will use a commonly known method, describe in Ref. [24]. Let us denote the eigenstates of $\hat{u}_j$ and $\hat{v}_j$ as $|\, u_j\rangle$ and $|\, v_j\rangle$, respectively, where u_j, v_j denote eigenvalues. Let us now look for all the n-partite product states $|\phi_k\rangle = |\eta\rangle_1|\eta\rangle_2.......|\eta\rangle_n$, each of which is associated to the zero probabilities given in argument (2):

$$\begin{aligned} &|\phi_k(x_1, .., x_{r-1}, v_r \neq d_r, u_{r+1} = 1, x_{r+2}, .., x_n)\rangle \\ &\equiv |\, x_1\rangle....|\, x_{r-1}\rangle|\, v_r \neq d_r\rangle|\, u_{r+1} = 1\rangle|\, x_{r+2}\rangle....|\, x_n\rangle \quad (8) \\ &\text{and}\ \ |\phi_0\rangle \equiv |\, v_1 = d_1\rangle|\, v_2 = d_2\rangle........|\, v_n = d_n\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that all the product states given in Eq. (8) are not linearly independent. Let there be only s linearly independent product states $\{|\, \phi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{s}$ in Eq. (8). It is not very difficult to see that $|\, \phi_0\rangle$ is orthogonal to all the states given in Eq. (8). Thus, states $\{|\, \phi_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{s}$ are all linearly independent states and span a $s+1$-dim. subspace $\mathbb{S}$ of $\mathcal{H}_1^{d_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{d_2} \otimes ..... \otimes H_n^{d_n}$. Here $s + 1 \leq d_1 d_2.....d_n - 1$, as $|\, \phi\rangle = |\, u_1 = 1\rangle|\, u_2 = 1\rangle....|\, \hat{u}_n = 1\rangle \notin \mathbb{S}$.

To satisfy the conditions given in Eqs. (2), a state ρ has to be confined to the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_1^{d_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{d_2} \otimes ..... \otimes H_n^{d_n}$, which is orthogonal to $\mathbb{S}$, call it a Hardy subspace $\mathbb{S}^{\perp}$. Thus, any state $\rho \in \mathbb{S}^{\perp}$ with $\langle\phi|\rho|\phi\rangle \neq 0$ will satisfy conditions (2).

Example: 3-qubit Modified Hardy-type state: Let us find the set of states ρ for which the conditions for our Hardy-type argument given by Eqns. (2) are satisfied for a given set of three observable pairs $(\hat{u}_j, \hat{v}_j)$ $(j = 1, 2, 3)$. Take (for all $j = 1, 2, 3$):

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{u}_j = 1\rangle &= \alpha_j|\hat{v}_j = 1\rangle + \beta_j|\hat{v}_j = 2\rangle, \\ |\hat{u}_j = 2\rangle &= \beta_j^*|\hat{v}_j = 1\rangle - \alpha_j^*|\hat{v}_j = 2\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $|\alpha_j|^2 + |\beta_j|^2 = 1$ and $0 < |\alpha_j|, |\beta_j| < 1$. The last condition is due to the non-commutativity of $\hat{u}_j$ and $\hat{v}_j$. Linearly independent product states associated with the zero probabilities in Eq. (2) are:

$$\begin{aligned} |\, \phi_0\rangle &= |\, v_1 = 2\rangle|\, v_2 = 2\rangle|\, v_3 = 2\rangle, \\ |\, \phi_1\rangle &= |\, v_1 = 1\rangle|\, u_2 = 1\rangle|\, u_3 = 1\rangle, \\ |\, \phi_2\rangle &= |\, v_1 = 1\rangle|\, u_2 = 1\rangle|\, u_3 = 2\rangle, \\ |\, \phi_3\rangle &= |\, u_1 = 1\rangle|\, v_2 = 1\rangle|\, u_3 = 1\rangle, \\ |\, \phi_4\rangle &= |\, u_1 = 2\rangle|\, v_2 = 1\rangle|\, u_3 = 1\rangle, \\ |\, \phi_5\rangle &= |\, u_1 = 1\rangle|\, u_2 = 1\rangle|\, v_3 = 1\rangle, \\ |\, \phi_6\rangle &= |\, u_1 = 1\rangle|\, u_2 = 2\rangle|\, v_3 = 1\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The product state associated with the first condition reads $|\, \phi_7\rangle = |\, u_1 = 1\rangle|\, u_2 = 1\rangle|\, u_3 = 1\rangle$.

State ρ that corresponds to conditions (2), has to be confined to a subspace of $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes C^2$, which is orthogonal to the subspace $\mathbb{S} = \{|\, \phi_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{6}$. However, it's not orthogonal to the product state $|\, \phi_7\rangle$. The subspace $\mathbb{S}$ has dimension seven, so ρ must be a pure genuine 3-qubit entangled state, which we denote as $|\, \psi\rangle$. As one can see, all the eight product states $\{|\, \phi_i\rangle\}_{i=0}^{7}$ are linearly independent, hence by using the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization procedure one can find an orthonormal basis $\{|\, \phi_i'\rangle\}_{i=0}^{7}$, in which state $|\, \psi\rangle$ is its last member, with $i = 7$:

$$|\, \phi_0'\rangle = |\, \phi_0\rangle,\ |\, \phi_i'\rangle = \frac{|\, \phi_i\rangle - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\langle\phi_j'|\phi_i\rangle|\, \phi_j'\rangle}{\sqrt{1 - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}|\langle\phi_j'|\phi_i\rangle|^2}},\ \text{for}\ i = 1, ..., 7.$$

The probability q in the conditions (2), for the Hardy state, reads

$$q = |\langle\psi|\phi_7\rangle|^2 = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{6}|\langle\phi_i'|\phi_7\rangle|^2 = \frac{|\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3|^2|\beta_1\beta_2\beta_3|^2}{1 - |\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3|^2}.$$

Its maximum possible value is 0.0181938. Further examples of Hardy states for bipartite cases can be found in [24].

We have also checked that for qubit systems, only a *unique* pure genuinely multipartite entangled state satisfies all conditions (2) (See the Supplementary Material). Thus, an important feature of original Hardy-type two-qubit argument is preserved. This feature is missing in most other multipartite Bell-type tests and totally absent in the case of generalized Hardy-type argument (1) for more than two-qubit case.

Quantum Anonymous Veto Protocol: Imagine a jury with N members, who need to take an unanimous decision, but at the same time want their individual decisions to remain secret. Hardy conditions

$$P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{u}_i = +1) = q > 0, \tag{9}$$

$$\forall\ r \leq N:\ P(\hat{v}_r = +1, \hat{u}_{r+1} = +1) = 0, \tag{10}$$

$$P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{v}_i = -1) = 0 \tag{11}$$

would allow them to achieve this. We shall present a specific case for $q = \frac{1}{2^N(2^N-1)}$.

Imagine that the observables in the above conditions are, say, $\hat{u}_k = \sigma_z$ and $\hat{v}_k = -\sigma_x$. In such a case only the following state has the properties (9-11)

$$|\phi_N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N - 1}} \left[2^{\frac{N}{2}} |1\rangle^{\otimes N} - |+\rangle^{\otimes N} \right], \qquad (12)$$

where $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [|0\rangle + |1\rangle]$. Here the computational basis is the one of σ_z, and $|+\rangle$ is the -1 eigenstate of $-\sigma_x$. Note, that due to the symmetry of the state with respect to any permutation of the qubits, the condition (10) can be replaced by a more general one: $\forall\ r \neq s :\ P(\hat{v}_r = +1, \hat{u}_s = +1) = 0$.

Each jury member receives one of the qubits, and can make secret measurements on them. The local measuring devices provide a choice between the two observables mentioned above (settings). Choosing $\hat{u}_k$ represents being "in favor", "vetoing" is represented by $\hat{v}_k$.

A high repetition rate (event ready) quantum interferometric device [27], sends qubits in the state to the jury members. Before every run, each of the members randomly chooses whether this run would be a voting one or testing one. The testing runs may use different settings, and their results and settings are announced (after the measurements are done). Testing measurements in principle perform a kind of state tomography, or state witness operation, which assures that the delivered state is indeed (12). Details can be spared. Otherwise, the jury members choose the setting corresponding to his/her own opinion and collect the measurement data. They send data to the referee after a certain data processing, described below.

Each jury member has a list of results under voting settings, correlated with the timing of the measurements. Those who vetoed randomly reject the runs, which yielded the outcome '+1' until the proportion between '+1's and '−1's in their table is $1 : (2^N - 2)$, as such would be the local statistics for those who were in favor. Next, all jury members randomly further reduce their lists by a certain big enough factor to a fixed (for all the same) number of entries. This is to hide how many results were rejected in the first step and hence again hide members' individual decisions. Next, each partner sends the list of their reduced samples (*i.e.*, the timing information of the selected events, but not their results) to the referee. The referee finds a common part of the lists of the timings. The list of common timings must be very large. This can be guaranteed by the high repetition rate of the source.

The referee then asks a random jury member at a time about his/her *result* in a randomly chosen run in the common part, and continues this procedure until in this way patiently collects all the results related with the runs that were sharing timing. The referee has all results for each run associated with a common timing, $x_i(T_k) = \pm 1$, where i denotes a jury member, and T_k is the timing.

If any jury member vetoes, but there was a disagreement, due to the condition (10), one cannot have $\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i(T_k) = N$ for any k. Thus if in the collected data the referee does not see strings of results related with the same T_k which have all +1's, he/she can safely (high statistics!) conclude that somebody was vetoing. However, if such a string is occurring (many times, we assume big statistics), the vote must be unanimous, because of (9) and the fact that for the state $P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{v}_i = +1) > 0$. If there is no string related to a common T_k with all results -1, everybody must have been against, see (11). Otherwise, the vote is unanimously in favour, as for the state $P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{u}_i = -1) > 0$.

This protocol requires many runs of the experiment. First, each jury member has to reject a fraction of local results, the referee accepts only the common part of the reduced lists, and still this common part must be large enough for the probability of having +1's at some position of all lists (which happens with probability $2^{-N}(2^N - 1)$) to be sufficiently large. This resembles the case of quantum key distribution, where a large part of data is spent on privacy amplification [25]. Here, the privacy is protected at two levels. First, the individual opinions are hidden by the corrections of local statistics. Second, the opinions are additionally protected by the symmetry of the state distributed among the partners. As the state is invariant under permutations of particles, $P(\hat{u}_r = i, \hat{v}_{r+1} = j) = P(\hat{v}_r = j, \hat{u}_{r+1} = i)$ for $i, j = \pm 1$, e.t.c..

In summary, our modified Hardy-type test does not involve any statistical inequality. For n qubit systems, we prove the uniqueness and purity of the Hardy state, and for the general case its genuine n-partite entanglement. We show that multi-qubit Hardy correlations allow one to find a simple anonymous veto protocol. Finally we remark that we also studied the maximum probability of success, q, of the modified Hardy-type test (2) for three two-level systems under a generalized non-signaling theory and in quantum theory. We found that the maximum value of the probability for quantum theory is 0.0181938, and for GNST it is 1/3. Interestingly, for both cases maximal q is lower than for two two qubits.

Acknowledgments: We thank Guruprasad Kar, Sibasish Ghosh and Mohamed Bourennane for stimulating discussions. R.R. and M.Z. acknowledge support by Foundation for Polish Science (FNP) TEAM/2011-8/9 project co-financed by EU European Regional Development Fund, and ERC grant QOLAPS(291348). M.W. acknowledges support from FNP (HOMING PLUS/2011-4/14) and project QUASAR.

[1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
[2] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, A. Zeilinger, "*Bell's*

Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe", M. Kafatos (Ed.), Kluwer, Dordrecht, 69-72 (1989), arXiv:0712.0921v1.

[3] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).

[4] L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 2981 (1992).

[5] G. Svetlichny, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 3066 (1987).

[6] M. Żukowski, Č. Brukner, W. Laskowski, and M. Wieśniak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 210402 (2002).

[7] W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, M. Żukowski, and Č. Brukner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 200401 (2004); W. Laskowski and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 062112 (2005).

[8] M. Seevinck and G. Svetlichny, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 060401 (2002).

[9] D. Collins, N. Gisin, S. Popescu, D. Roberts, and V. Scarani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 170405 (2002).

[10] J.-D. Bancal, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, and Y-C Liang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 020405 (2011).

[11] J. Barrett, S. Pironio, J.-D. Bancal, N. Gisin, arXiv:1112.2626v1.

[12] N. Brunner, J. Sharam, and T. Vértesi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.***108**, 110501 (2012).

[13] S. K. Choudhary, S. Ghosh, G. Kar and R. Rahaman, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 042107 (2010).

[14] S. Yu, Q. Chen, C. Zhang, C. H. Lai and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 120402 (2012).

[15] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).

[16] S. Lloyd, *Science* **273**, 1073 (1996).

[17] L. Pezzé and A. Smerzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 100401 (2009).

[18] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** 865 (2009).

[19] J.-W. Pan, Z.-B. Chen, C.-Y. Lu, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, and M. Żukowski, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 777 (2012).

[20] D. Chuam, *Jour. Crypt.* **1**, 65 (1998).

[21] F. Hao and P. Zieliński, *A 2-round anonymous veto protocol, Proc. 14th Works. Secur. Prot. 2006*

[22] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, and D. Sarkar, *Phys. Lett. A* **243**, 249 (1998); X.-H. Wu and R.-H. Xie, *Phys. Lett. A* **211**, 129 (1996).

[23] S. K. Chudhary, S. Ghosh, G. Kar, S. Kunkri, R. Rahaman, and A. Roy, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **10**, 0859 (2010).

[24] K. S. Parasuram and S. Ghosh, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**, 315305 (2011).

[25] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and J.-M. Robert, *SIAM Jour. Comput.* **17(2)**, 210(1988).

[26] The state is not-biseparable with respect to any partition of subsystems.

[27] For a review of such techniques see [19].

Proof of the Uniqueness of the Hardy State for Qubit Systems

Let us put the n-qubit modified Hardy's conditions:

$$P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{u}_i = +1) = q > 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\forall\ r \leq n:\ P(\hat{v}_r = +1, \hat{u}_{r+1} = +1) = 0, \tag{14}$$

$$P(\forall\ i\ :\ \hat{v}_i = -1) = 0, \tag{15}$$

Lemma 1.1. *Only a* unique *pure genuinely entangled n qubit state satisfies (13-15).*

Proof: We show the uniqueness proof only, the proof for the genuineness is already given in the main article. Let us denote the eigenstates of $\hat{u}_j$ ($\hat{v}_j$) with eigenvalue $+1$ and -1 by $|\,0_j\rangle(|+\rangle_j)$ and $|\,1_j\rangle(|-\rangle_j)$, respectively. Let us also denote the n-qubit product states associated to the zero probabilities given in Eqn. (14) as

$$|\phi(x_1,..,x_2,+_r,0_{r+1},x_{r+2},..,x_n)\rangle \equiv |\,x_1\rangle....|\,x_{r-1}\rangle|\,+_r\rangle|\,0_{r+1}\rangle|\,x_{r+2}\rangle....|\,x_n\rangle, \tag{16}$$

where $|\,x_j\rangle \in \{|\,0_j\rangle, |\,1_j\rangle, |+\rangle_j, |-\rangle_j\}$, and the product states associated to the zero probability given in Eqn. (15) as

$$|\phi_0\rangle \equiv |\,-\rangle|\,-\rangle........|\,-\rangle. \tag{17}$$

The product state

$$|\,\phi_+\rangle = |\,0\rangle|\,0\rangle....|\,0\rangle....|\,0\rangle, \tag{18}$$

is associated with the non-zero probability given in Eqn. (15). Note that the states given in Eqns. (16-18) are not linearly independent. Let's define a new product basis:

$$\begin{gathered}
|\,00...0...0\rangle = |\,\phi_+\rangle \\
|\,00...01_l0...0\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\beta_l}\left[|\,\phi_k(0,..,0,+_l,0,...,0)\rangle - \alpha_l|\,\phi_+\rangle\right], \\
|\,0...01_l0...01_m0...0\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\beta_l\beta_m}[|\,\phi_k(0,...,0,+_l,0,...,0,+_m,0,...,0)\rangle - \alpha_l\alpha_m|\,\phi_+\rangle \\
-\beta_l\alpha_m|\,00...01_l0...0\rangle - \alpha_l\beta_m|\,00...01_m0...0\rangle], \\
|\,0...01_l0...01_m0...01_k0...0\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\beta_l\beta_m\beta_k}[|\,\phi_k(0,...,0,+_l,0,...,0,+_m,0,...,0,+_k,0,...,0)\rangle - \alpha_l\alpha_m\alpha_k|\,\phi_+\rangle \\
-\alpha_l\alpha_m\beta_k|\,00...01_k0...0\rangle - \alpha_l\beta_m\alpha_k|\,00...01_m0...0\rangle - \beta_l\alpha_m\alpha_k|\,00...01_l0...0\rangle \\
-\alpha_l\beta_m\beta_k|\,00...01_m0...01_k0...0\rangle - \beta_l\alpha_m\beta_k|\,00...01_l0...01_k0...0\rangle - \beta_l\beta_m\alpha_k|\,00...01_l0...01_m0...0\rangle], \\
...... \\
|\,11...1...1\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^*}[|\,\phi_0\rangle - \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1,j\neq i}^n \alpha_j^*\beta_i^*|\,00...01_i0...0\rangle + ... + (-1)^n \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1,j\neq i}^n \alpha_i^*\beta_j^*|\,11...10_i1...1\rangle],
\end{gathered}$$

where $|\,+\rangle_j = \alpha_j|\,0\rangle_j + \beta_j|\,1\rangle_j$, and $|\,-\rangle_j = \beta_j^*|\,0\rangle_j - \alpha_j^*|\,1\rangle_j$ with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Therefore, the product states given in Eqns. (16-18) span the full 2^n-dim. Hilbert space $\mathcal{C}_1^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_2^2 \otimes ... \otimes C_n^2$. Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{|\,\phi(x_1,..,x_2,+_r,0_{r+1},x_{r+2},..,x_n)\rangle\}$, be the subspace spanned by the product states given in Eqn. (16). Now $|\,\phi_+\rangle \not\perp |\,\phi_0\rangle$, whereas $|\,\phi_0\rangle \perp \mathcal{S}_1$, therefore, $|\,\phi_+\rangle \notin \mathcal{S}_1$. Also, $|\,\phi_0\rangle$ and $|\,\phi_+\rangle$ are linearly independent and $\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \{|\,\phi_0\rangle, |\,\phi_+\rangle\}$ is 2^n-dimensional, therefore, $\mathcal{S}_1$ must be a (2^n-2)-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{C}_1^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_2^2 \otimes ... \otimes C_n^2$. Hence, the dimension of $\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \{|\,\phi_0\rangle\}$ $(= \mathcal{S})$ is $2^n - 1$.

To satisfy the conditions given in Eqns. (13-15), a density operator ρ has to be orthogonal to the subspace $\mathcal{S}$ (of $\mathcal{C}_1^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}_2^2 \otimes ... \otimes C_n^2$) spanned by the product states given in Eqns. (16-17). So ρ must have rank one and it is unique, *i.e.*, ρ is a unique pure entangled state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ of n-qubits, and one has $q = |\langle\psi|\phi_+\rangle|^2 > 0$.